

REMARKS

Claims 32 and 40-53 are pending in the application upon entry of this amendment. Claim 30 has been canceled. Claim 53 has been newly added. Claims 32, 40, and 47 have been amended. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and following comments.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

Claims 30, 32, and 40-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Withdraw of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

i. Claim 30

The Examiner explains that the rejection of claim 30, which was previously indicated as being allowed, was inadvertently missed with respect to §112 issues in the previous Office Action. More specifically, the Examiner notes that the preamble of the claim is directed to “a recording medium for recording information”, but the body of the claim recites recording parameters and their relationship $g(v)$, instead of further reciting features of the medium. Therefore, the Examiner states that it is not clear whether the scope of claim 30 is to be drawn to a recording medium, or a use thereof.

Claim 30 has been canceled, and new claim 53 has been added, which recites features similar to those of original claim 30, but in terms of the structure of the claimed recording medium. Such features are presented in accordance with the claim terminology used when previously introducing new claims 40 and 47 (e.g., claim 53 recites “an optimum recording parameter value PMv1” instead of “a first recording parameter”).

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the scope of new claim 53 is drawn to a recording medium.

ii. Claims 40 and 47

With regard to independent claims 40 and 47, the Examiner indicates that the phrase “linear velocities” is vague. Specifically, the Examiner states that it is not clear whether the linear velocities are the rotational speed of a recording medium or any other recording means. Furthermore, the Examiner states that it is not clear whether the claimed linear velocity v in the recording step (b) is selected from the claimed linear

velocities in the recording step (a).

The Examiner also indicates that the phrase “pulse sequences” is vague. The Examiner states that it is not clear whether the pulses are a form of recording data or a form of the claimed linear velocities. Furthermore, the Examiner states that it is not clear whether the claimed pulse sequence in the recording step (b) is selected from the claimed pulse sequences in the recording step (a).

Claims 40 and 47 have been amended to address the Examiner’s rejections. For example, amended claim 40 recites that the recording method comprises the steps of:

(a) generating a plurality of pulse sequences for recording data to a recording medium corresponding to a plurality of linear velocities of rotation of the recording medium in the range v_a to v_b ;

...

(b) while rotating a recording medium with a linear velocity v selected from the plurality of linear velocities in the range v_a to v_b , forming at least one of a recording mark and a space by irradiating the recording medium with a pulse sequence selected from the plurality of pulse sequences, wherein the pulse sequence is determined by a set of recording parameters calculated from the corresponding recording parameter approximation function $h(v)$.

Claim 47 recites similar features.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

II. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to

Attorney Docket No: 10/562,756

charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/

Mark D. Saralino

Reg. No. 34,243

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113